

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOSEPH STANELY PIGOTT,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 25-mc-00019-JHC

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on pro se petitioner Joseph Stanley Pigott's Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis (IFP), Dkt. No. 1, and his pleading entitled, "Defendant's Notice of Removal and Complaint for False Imprisonment by Judge Johanna Bender, Lisa Manion Prosecuting Attorney, Camile Eatwell Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, Judge David S. Keenan, Steven John Adams Supervisor for (S.C.R.A.P.) WSBA# 32566 Under Rule 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1455 (Federal Question)." Dkt. # 1-1. Pigott, who identifies himself as King Abdul Mumin El, lists himself as Defendant and the State of Washington as Plaintiff. *Id.* He appears to seek the removal of a pending criminal case in King County Superior Court to federal district court. For the reasons discussed below, the Court DISMISSES this matter with prejudice.

1 A complaint filed by any party that seeks to proceed IFP under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) is
2 subject to screening, and a court must dismiss a complaint that is frivolous, malicious, fails to
3 state a claim, or seeks damages from defendants that are immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. §
4 1915(e)(2)(B); *see Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1126–27 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc). Every
5 complaint must include “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is
6 entitled to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). The plaintiff does not need to provide detailed factual
7 allegations, but “[t]hreadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere
8 conclusory statements, do not suffice.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (citing *Bell*
9 *Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)). Still, where the plaintiff is pro se, courts
10 “construe the pleadings liberally and afford the petitioner the benefit of any doubt.” *Hebbe v.*
11 *Pliler*, 627 F.3d 338, 342 (9th Cir. 2010) (quoting *Bretz v. Kelman*, 773 F.2d 1026, 1027 n.1 (9th
12 Cir.1985) (en banc)).

13 Even construing Pigott’s claims liberally, he fails to state a claim. As another court in
14 this District has explained to him, he does not meet the requirements to remove the criminal
15 proceedings in King County Superior Court to federal court. Case No. 23-mc-00092-LK, ECF
16 No. 4 at 3–4. His other pleadings similarly do not appear to state a claim under Rule 8 because,
17 among other reasons, he fails to state the relief that he seeks and he does not identify a statute or
18 Constitutional provision that has been violated. Dkt. # 1-1; Fed. R. Civ. P. 8.

19 Accordingly, the Court ORDERS that this action is DISMISSED with prejudice.¹ The
20 motion to proceed in forma pauperis, Dkt. # 1, is STRICKEN as moot. The Clerk of the Court
21 shall provide a copy of this order to Pigott.

22
23
24 ¹ “Courts are not required to grant leave to amend if a complaint lacks merit entirely.” *Lopez v.*
Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1129 (9th Cir. 2000).

1 Dated this 16th day of May, 2025.

2 

3 John H. Chun

4 United States District Judge